

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,117	12/15/2003	Lennart J. Brandel	7343-1	3626
75	90 02/09/2006		EXAMINER	
JOHNS MANVILLE			SINGH, ARTI R	
Legal Department 10100 West Ute Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Littleton, CO	80127		1771	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1./
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	!
	10/736,117	BRANDEL ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ms. Arti Singh	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addres	s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commun D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final.		rits is
·	in parto quayro, 1000 o.b. 11, 10	.0 0.0. 210.	
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 9 and 11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the addrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stag	e
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)	ı

Application/Control Number: 10/736,117 Page 2

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's amendments and accompanying remarks dated 11/28/05. Applicant's amendments have been entered. The only rejection withdrawn is the double patenting rejection over 09/996454. All other rejections have been maintained and made final.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's first traversal is that USPN 6291011 does not teach the amended limitation in Claim 1, which recites "the warp density of the fabric ranges from 2.5 to 20 threads/cm and the weft density ranges from 2.0 to 12 threads/cm". This analysis is incorrect. Said patent recites the warp to have 315 to 340 ends per meter, when converted equals 3.15 to 3.40 cm, and the weft when converted equals 1.7 to 6 ends per cm. Therefore this limitation is still anticipated by the reference.

The second traversal is over the obviousness type double patenting over copending Application 09/996454, 10/348725, 10/460287 and 10/736119.

The rejection made over 09/997454 is withdrawn as Applicant has cancelled the claims in question.

The rejection over 10/736119 is maintained as the titer can be either 10-125 or 68-60 which stills falls within the claimed ranged and is still an obvious variant. This rejection is maintained.

The rejection over 10/348225 and 10/460287 are both also maintained, as glass slivers are a form of glass fibers. In this case the instant application is the Genus and 10/348225 and 10/460287 are the species, and thus they are encompassed by one another.

Application/Control Number: 10/736,117 Page 3

Art Unit: 1771

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

- 4. Claims 1-7, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 6291011 issued to Edlund et al as set forth in paragraph 7-8 of the previous office action.
- 5. Claims 1-7, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6759116 issued to Edlund et al as set forth in paragraph 9 of the previous office action.

Double Patenting

6. Claims 1-7, 9 and 11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over of copending Application No.

Art Unit: 1771

10/348725 (claims 1-5), 10/460287 (claims 1-12) and 10/736119 (claims 1-10). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the reason set forth in the previous office action and further enhanced above.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ms. Arti Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-1483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/736,117 Page 5

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBS) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ms. Arti Singh Primary Examiner Art Unit 1771

ars